### California Transportation Commission Streets and Highways Committee May 6, 2003

# DISCUSSION DRAFT

### REVIEW OF ALLOCATION PLAN PROJECT CATEGORIES

#### **Issue**

At the April 3 Commission meeting, in response to testimony on the Allocation Plan, the Commission asked staff to review the classification of projects that were identified in the noncapacity category and to review the definitions used in defining the priority categories. Should the Commission now amend the Allocation Plan list approved at the April meeting by reclassifying some projects?

#### **Recommendation:**

After review of the projects previously classified as noncapacity, staff recommends changes for the following projects:

- 1. Classify the following park and ride projects as at significant risk of losing other funding. Each is designated for Federal demonstration or discretionary grant funding:
  - a. \$125,000 for the Rohnert Park Expressway Park and Ride, Sonoma County. Project has ISTEA demonstration grant for \$500,000.
  - b. \$323,000 for CMAQ match for the Rohnert Park Expressway Park and Ride. As above. Includes on ramp improvements needed to build the park and ride.
  - c. \$311,000 for the Manzanita Park and Ride, phase 2, Marin. This STIP project expands the existing lot to support a shuttle to parklands, supported by a \$1 million Federal discretionary grant under the Transportation and Community and System Preservation Pilot Program.
- 2. Classify the following soundwall projects as required mitigation. Each of these projects is mitigation required for an interchange project funded with non-STIP funds:
  - a. \$1.145 million for Chula Vista soundwalls, San Diego County.
  - b. \$750,000 for Bakersfield soundwalls at the Route 99 White Lane interchange.
- 3. Classify projects for rehabilitation to relinquish State highways as required mitigation. Although this is rehabilitation work, it is a requirement for relinquishment of sections of highway that have been replaced by new alignment.
  - a. \$2.070 million on Route 111, Gillett Rd to Worthington, Imperial County.
  - b. \$152,000 on Routes 86 and 111, Coachella and Indio, Riverside County.

- 4. Classify the following project as capacity:
  - a. The BART Pittsburg-Antioch terminal zone turnback project. This project would add system capacity by reducing train headways from 15 minutes to 5 minutes. Note that this project is programmed only for design work in FY 2002-03 and thus would still not be included in the allocation plan for the current fiscal year.

### **Background**

Current cash flow projections indicate that there are not sufficient funds available for the Commission to allocate funding to all STIP projects that are programmed for delivery during the remainder of FY 2002-03 and FY 2003-04. On April 3, the Commission approved a STIP Allocation Plan designating which projects would receive allocations through June 2003, subject to delivery. The selection of projects was based on criteria approved by the Commission and a project list prepared in accordance with those criteria by Commission staff. The criteria were originally approved on February 27. They were reviewed, together with a preliminary project list at a special meeting on March 12.

The STIP allocation plan approved for the remainder of FY 2002-03 included only projects that had been placed in one of four high priority categories:

- Required mitigation for projects already allocated.
- Projects at significant risk of losing other funding if not allocated.
- Planning, programming, and monitoring.
- Capacity projects with construction programmed in FY 2002-03 or earlier.

The other categories included:

- Pre-construction programming for capacity projects where construction is programmed in a later fiscal year.
- Noncapacity projects.
- Projects programmed in the STIP for FY 2003-04 or later.
- Projects requiring TCR program funding not yet allocated.

Between the March 12 and April 3 meetings, Commission staff changed the classification of several projects on the project list, based on comments and inquiries from Caltrans and regional agencies and based on a staff review of the programming, scope and funding of particular projects.

At the April 3 meeting and in subsequent correspondence with Commissioners and staff, the sponsors of several projects have claimed that their projects should have been classified differently. Some have claimed that projects classified as noncapacity should have been treated as capacity projects. Others have argued that their projects should have been included in the Allocation Plan because they are at significant risk of losing other funding or that they are required mitigation work. At the April 3 meeting, the Commission asked staff to review the projects and the standards that were used to apply the allocation plan criteria. This review was to be reported back to the Commission for consideration at the May 22 meeting.

The project list presented at the April 3 Commission meeting identified \$67.6 million in FY 2002-03 construction projects as noncapacity projects. In addition, \$8.5 million in preconstruction programming for projects with construction in a later year were classified as noncapacity. The list did not classify projects programmed only in later fiscal years as capacity or noncapacity.

After review, staff found that a \$7.0 million project that was included among the FY 02-03 noncapacity projects is actually programmed for FY 03-04. That project is for the San Diego MTDB regional automated fare system. The remaining \$60.6 million in FY 2002-03 construction projects that were classified as noncapacity include:

- \$20.5 million for local road rehabilitation and reconstruction projects.
- \$ 2.2 million for rehabilitation to relinquish State highways.
- \$ 1.9 million for local transit rehabilitation and restoration projects.
- \$ 4.5 million for other rail and transit noncapacity projects.
- \$13.3 million for signalization and intersection projects.
- \$ 6.6 million for bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- \$ 6.4 million for soundwalls.
- \$ 2.4 million for RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match reserves (undesignated).
- \$ 2.0 million for rideshare programs.
- \$ 0.8 million for park and ride lots.

A spreadsheet listing all of these projects is attached.

#### **Discussion:**

In defining and applying the categories in the allocation plan, Commission staff used the following general standards:

- Required mitigation for projects already allocated. This included projects for which the work was required to comply with an environmental document or permit for a parent STIP project that had already been allocated. Staff now proposes to expand this category to include STIP-funded mitigation that is required for parent projects that were fully funded with non-STIP funds. Staff also proposes to expand this category to include rehabilitation required to relinquish a State highway that is tied to the construction of a project already allocated.
- Project at significant risk of losing other funding if not committed. This category was limited to projects with transportation funding that would otherwise be lost to the State of California. This included, for example, Federal demonstration funding specifically designated for the project and Federal discretionary grants available only for the project. It also included STIP match in rural counties for Federal Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRR) funding because Federal law requires a portion of the State's HBRR apportionment be expended on off-system bridges.

Projects were not included in this category simply on the basis that non-STIP funds were also committed for the project, including RSTP and CMAQ funds. The general presumption was that the non-STIP funds could be applied to other projects and were not at significant risk of being lost to California. Some agencies cited the potential project loss of RSTP or CMAQ

funds because of the timely use funds provision of AB 1012. These projects were not included in this category because there is no risk that the Federal funds would be lost to California. Under AB 1012, any funds that a project loses in this way revert to the Commission for redirection.

- <u>Capacity and noncapacity projects</u>. Road projects were classified as capacity projects if they would add through lanes. Transit projects were classified as capacity projects if they would add new tracks or purchase passenger rail cars or buses. The following types of projects were treated as <u>noncapacity</u> for the purpose of applying the Commission's allocation plan criteria:
  - Local road rehabilitation and reconstruction. The Commission's criteria explicitly identified local road rehabilitation as noncapacity. Reconstruction projects are essentially the same, though they made include added design features, including curbs, gutters, sidewalks, or drainage facilities.
  - Rehabilitation to relinquish State highways. Staff originally classified these projects as noncapacity because they do not add through roadway capacity. However, staff now recommends that these projects be treated as a required mitigation for projects already allocated. With the completion of a project to construct a State highway on a new alignment, the State has an obligation to rehabilitate the old highway before relinquishing it to a local agency. The cost of doing this work is, in effect, a part of the cost of the new alignment. The relinquishment also relieves the State of liability for future maintenance.
  - Local transit rehabilitation and restoration. The Commission's criteria explicitly identified transit rehabilitation as noncapacity.
  - Other rail and transit. Staff classified several other transit projects as noncapacity because they did not add track or guideway or purchase passenger equipment. These included projects for bus and rail station improvements, station parking lots, an automated fare system, and carsharing development.
  - Signalization and intersection projects. Staff classified signalization and intersection projects as noncapacity because they are operational improvements that do not add through roadway capacity. Staff is recommending no change.
  - o <u>Bicycle and pedestrian projects</u>. Staff classified these projects as noncapacity because they do not add substantially to road or transit capacity.
  - Soundwalls. Staff classified these projects as noncapacity because they are retrofit enhancements that do not increase road or transit capacity. However, staff now recommends reclassifying 2 soundwall projects as required mitigation. Those 2 projects are mitigations for parent projects that were funded from non-STIP sources.
  - O <u>Undesignated match reserves</u>. Staff classified these reserves as noncapacity because the specific projects purposes for the reserves were not identified, other than to match RSTP, CMAQ, or TEA funds. Most reserves are for matching CMAQ or TEA, which by definition are not available for capacity-increasing projects.
  - o <u>Rideshare programs</u>. Staff classified these projects as noncapacity because they do not add to roadway or transit capacity.

O Park and ride lots. Staff classified park and ride projects as noncapacity because they do not add directly to roadway or transit capacity. As noted above, however, the staff has now identified both of the park and ride lot projects that were on the original allocation plan list as being projects at risk of losing designated Federal funds.

### **Local Agency Comments**

The following is a summary of comments and requests received concerning projects other than those included in the staff recommendation.

- Contra Costa. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) has requested categorizing the Martinez Bay Trail project as "at significant risk of losing other funding," citing a \$325,000 grant to the City of Martinez from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). STIP funding is \$300,000. Total project cost is \$675,000. Staff did not classify this funding as at risk because it would not be lost to California. See the prior discussion above.
- <u>Riverside</u>. Staff of the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) have requested that the City of Indio's project for rehabilitation of Indio Blvd be classified as "at significant risk of losing other funding," citing other funding sources, including \$1.7 million of TEA and RSTP and \$2.2 million in local funds. STIP funding is \$325,000. Staff did not classify this funding as at risk because it would not be lost to California. See the prior discussion above.
- <u>Riverside</u>. Staff of RCTC have requested that Riverside County's project for reconstruction work on Van Buren Blvd be given "special consideration" for funding, noting that the County "is preparing a report that will outline the accidents and fatalities that have occurred and will be forwarding it to the CTC." Staff classified this project as noncapacity with other local road rehabilitation and reconstruction projects.
- <u>Monterey</u>. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) requested allocation for 5 non-capacity-increasing projects, citing their high local priority and job creation potential. Supporting requests were also received from the City of Monterey, Monterey-Salinas Transit, and the City of Greenfield.
- <u>BART</u>. The Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) has requested allocations for 4 BART projects not included in the allocation plan. They include:
  - SFO extension bikeway, \$1.343 million. Classified as noncapacity, with other bicycle and pedestrian projects. BART cites its commitment to the bikeway as a key factor in securing San Mateo's contribution of \$185 million to BART's extension programs.
  - Pittsburg-Bay Point Terminal Zone project, programmed \$350,000 for design in FY 02-03 and \$1,150,000 for construction in FY 03-04. Originally classified as noncapacity, Commission staff is recommending reclassification to capacity. However, Commission criteria would not include the design of a project scheduled for later construction in the allocation plan.
  - o Richmond Parking Garage expansion, programmed \$200,000 for design in FY 02-03 and \$1,800,000 for construction in FY 03-04. Staff classified as noncapacity, along

- with other transit parking lots and structures. BART cites the project as a "linchpin element" of a 3-party agreement to introduce \$100 million of development around the station.
- Embarcadero and Montgomery Stations seismic retrofit conceptual engineering, \$500,000. Programmed under Advance Project Development Element. Staff classified as noncapacity, along with other transit station projects. Even if the project were classified as capacity, it would have received lower priority under the Commission's criteria because it is not programmed for construction. BART cites need for project to allow BART to accommodate in the seismic retrofit design future increases in station capacity and enhancements.
- <u>San Luis Obispo</u>. The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) requested that 2 projects be reclassified and that 2 be considered for priority as funding increases for projects already allocated.
  - City of Morro Bay Route 1/41 roundabout. Requested classification as capacity. Staff classified this project as noncapacity, with other signalization and intersection projects.
  - Ocity of San Luis Obispo Santa Barbara Street widening. Staff listed this with projects deliverable in FY 02-03 though programmed later, as reported in our delivery survey. SLOCOG requests classification as capacity-increasing and reports construction scheduled for March 2004. Staff recognizes this project as capacity. However, the project is actually programmed for design and right-of-way in FY 03-04 and construction in FY 04-05.
  - City of Grover Beach Oak Park widening. This project augments an earlier project, voted in June 2001, now with an extension to award to February 2004. The project is programmed for construction in FY 03-04.
  - Ocity of Arroyo Grande East Grand Avenue rehabilitation. SLOCOG describes this project as the second component of a project that has already received allocations and extensions to award by May 2003. The project is a local road rehabilitation project and is programmed for construction in FY 03-04.
- Santa Clara. The City of Palo Alto has requested approval for an allocation of \$293,000 from the Santa Clara County CMAQ match reserve for a pedestrian/bicycle undercrossing of the Caltrain tracks at Homer Avenue. The City cites a contribution of \$325,000 from the Air District, the potential savings of doing the project during Caltrain's weekend closure for rail improvements, and the project's creation of construction jobs. This funding was classified as noncapacity, as a part of the undesignated CMAQ match from Santa Clara County. With identification of the project, staff would classify the project as noncapacity with other pedestrian and bicycle projects.
- <u>MTC</u>. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has requested funding priority by reclassification for several projects. They include:
  - o Projects requested to be classified with required mitigation. Neither of these meets the test applied by staff. See the prior discussion.
    - BART, SFO bicycle and pedestrian path. See BART, above.

- City of Fairfield, Central Way overlay. The MTC notes that the City had traded this project from other funding to the STIP so that activities could proceed on projects related to the Interstate 80/680 interchange. CTC staff notes that this "prior commitment" was not a commitment of the CTC.
- Projects requested to be classified as "at risk of loss of funding if not allocated."
  MTC cites non-STIP funding leveraged. None of these projects meets the test applied by staff. See the prior discussion.
  - City of Sausalito, Bridgeway rehabilitation. \$411,000 in RSTP funds.
  - City of Lafayette, Reliez Valley Road regional trail gap. \$420,000 in CMAQ funds.
  - City of Martinez Bay Trail. See Contra Costa, above.
  - City of Palo Alto, Homer Avenue bicycle and pedestrian undercrossing. See Santa Clara, above.
  - Santa Clara County, San Jose SMART Corridor and Stevens Creek ITS, match for CMAQ of over \$3 million.

		Allocation STIP Project Totals by Compon								ponent	
	County	Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Month	Total		Const		PS&E
	-										
	Local Road Rehab	oilitation:									
RIP	Alameda	Union City	loc	2198	Alvarado-Niles, pavement rehab	Jun-03	240	0	240	0	
RIP	Butte	Butte County	loc	1L47	West 8th Av reconstruction (ext 5-02)	May-03	22	0	0	0	22
RIP	Butte	Butte County	loc	2L93	Neal Rd, 4.7-5.9 mi E of Rt 99, rehab	May-03	610	0	610	0	0
RIP	Butte	Butte County	loc	2L94	Oroville Bangor Hwy reconst (ext 6-02)	May-03	85	0	0	0	85
RIP	Butte	Paradise	loc	2L114	Almond St, Elliott-Fir, rehab	Jun-03	195	0		0	
RIP	Butte	Paradise	loc	2L119	Pearson Rd, Skyway-Black Olive, rehab	Feb-03	522	0	522	0	0
RIP	Contra Costa	Danville	loc		Oak Hill Park frontage improvements (State only)	Jun-03	62	0	62	0	0
RIP	Glenn	Willows	loc	3L72	Pacific Av, Green-N City Limits, reconst (State only)	Feb-03	7	0	0	1	6
RIP	Humboldt	Arcata	loc		K/Alliance, Samoa-Foster, rehab	Jun-03	660	0	660	0	0
RIP	Humboldt	Eureka	loc	2074	RR crossings, 3 locations, rehab (State only)	Jun-03	100	0	100	0	0
RIP	Inyo	Bishop	loc	4	Wye Road, Rt 6-Spruce, recon (ext 6-01)	Feb-03	385	0	385	0	0
RIP	Inyo	Bishop	loc		Home St, Rt 168-Sierra, reconstruction	Apr-03	410	0	410	0	0
RIP	Inyo	Bishop	loc	1503	Mandich, Sneden, S 3rd, Warren, rehab (SO)(incr)	Apr-03	56	0	0	0	56
RIP		Bishop	loc		Mandich, Sneden, S 3rd, Warren, rehab (SO)(incr)	May-03	14	0	14	0	0
	•	Inyo County	loc		Shabbell Lane, overlay	Jun-03	105	0	94	0	11
RIP	Inyo	Inyo County	loc	4019	Tuttle Creek Road, overlay	Jun-03	224	0	200	0	24
		Inyo County	loc		Substation Road, overlay	Jun-03	111	0	99	0	12
	Lake	Clearlake	loc		Lakeshore, Pearl, Howard, Uhl, rehab (02S-43)	May-03	360	0	360	0	
	Marin	Sausalito	loc		Bridgeway, Princess-Johnson, rehab	Apr-03	131	0	121	0	10
RIP	Mariposa	Mariposa Co	loc		Darrah Rd, Hwy 49 South-Triangle, rehab	Feb-03	415	0	415	0	0
RIP	Modoc	Alturas	loc		Warner St, Park-Rt 299, rehab (02 STIP)	Feb-03	1,495	0	1,495	0	0
RIP	Mono	Mono County	loc		Lundy Lake Rd, rehab (ext 6-02)	Apr-03	1,310	1	1,294	0	15
RIP	Monterey	Greenfield	loc	1013	El Camino Real, Apple-Walnut, rehab (00S-65)	Jun-03	50	0	50	0	0
RIP	Monterey	King City	loc	1014	Broadway, Russ-3rd, reconstruct (00S-65)	Jun-03	50	0	50	0	0
RIP		Monterey	loc	1156	Del Monte Av, Sloat-Palo Verde, reconstruct (SO)	May-03	885	0	885	0	0
RIP	Monterey	Soledad	loc	1015	West St, Front St, rehab (00S-65)	Feb-03	61	0	57	0	
RIP	Plumas	Plumas County	loc	2045	CR 109, rehab and safety (ext 5-02)	Jun-03	1,417	0	1,417	0	0
RIP	Plumas	Plumas County	loc	2045	CR 109, rehab and safety	Jun-03	558	0	558	0	0
RIP	Plumas	Plumas County	loc	2233	Quincy Jct Rd, pavement rehab	Feb-03	280	0	280	0	
		Plumas County	loc	2244	Lake Davis Rd, rehab (00S-7)	Feb-03	415	0		0	
RIP	Plumas	Plumas County	loc		Rd A-15 PM 3.6-5.0, rehab (00S-7)	Jun-03	200	0		0	
		Plumas County	loc	2250	Big Cove Rd, rehab (00S-7)	Feb-03	200	0		0	
RIP	Plumas	Plumas County	loc		Lee Rd, rehab (00S-7)	Feb-03	290	0	280	0	
RIP	Plumas	Plumas County	loc	2254	Bucks Lake Rd, Meadow Valley, reh (00S-7)	Feb-03	315	0		0	25
RIP	Riverside	Indio	loc	OM	Indio Bl, Jackson-Rt 111, rehab (00S-59)	Apr-03	325	0		0	0
RIP	Riverside	Riverside Co	loc	1103	Van Buren Bl, Wash'n-Ora Terrace, median, turnouts	May-03	1,323	0	1,323	0	
RIP	Sacramento	Sacramento	loc		N 3rd, Vine, Sproule, Pk Riviera, Dayton, recon	Feb-03	1,891	0	1,891	0	
RIP	San Benito	San Juan Bautista	loc	853	Curbs, gutters, sidewalks, storm drains (State only)	May-03	133	0	133	0	0
RIP	Siskiyou	Dorris	loc		Main St, Triangle St, State St, rehab (State only)	Feb-03	320	0		0	
	•	Montague	loc		Prather St, rehab (State only)	Feb-03	350	0	322	8	
	Siskiyou	Tulelake	loc		Modoc St, F St, rehab (State only)	May-03	350	0	325	0	
	Siskiyou	Yreka	loc		Greenhorn Rd rehab	Apr-03	451	0	451	0	

						Allocation	STIP	Project	Totals	by Com	ponent
	County	Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Month	Total	R/W	Const	E&P	PS&E
	Solano	Fairfield	loc		Central Way, Ritchie-Pitman, overlay	Feb-03	158	0	158	0	
	Tehama	Tehama	loc		7 streets, rehab (summer 2003)	Feb-03	157	0	148	1	
	Tehama	Tehama County	loc		Rd 99W, at Red Bank Creek, over 0.5 mi	May-03	109	0	109	0	_
	Tehama	Tehama County	loc		Tyler Rd at Rd 99W, improvs/rehab	May-03	182	0	182	0	
	Trinity	Trinity County	loc		Hyampom Rd, PM 0.0-3.5, rehab	Apr-03	729	0	729	0	
	Tulare	Visalia	loc		9 street segments, rehab	May-03	934	0	904	0	
	Tuolumne	Sonora	loc		Grade xings, Sanguinetti/Old Wards (ext 6-01)	Jan-03	33	0	33	0	-
	Tuolumne	Sonora	loc		City street rehab & safety, 6 locations (State only)	May-03	210	0	210	0	-
RIP	Yolo	Davis	loc	2L80	Pavement rehab, phase 2	May-03	600	0	600	0	0
							20,495				<b></b>
											<b></b>
DID		Relinquish State				4 00	0.070		0.070		-
	Imperial	Caltrans	111		Rehab to relinquish, Gillett Rd-Worthington	Apr-03	2,070	0	,	0	_
IIP	Riverside	Caltrans	86	75J	Rehab/relinq, city, Rt 86,111,195 /75D (split,6-02 vote)	Jun-03	152	0	152	0	0
							2,222				
		1.00									<u> </u>
חום		habilitation and Ro			Facing transposition which	Dan 00	600	0	600	0	0
	Alameda	AC Transit	bus		Engine transmission rehab	Dec-02	628	0	628	0	
	Monterey	MST	bus		Rehab 12 diesel buses	May-03	540	0	540	0	
	San Bernardino	Needles	tea	1E		Feb-03	75	0	0	0	
RIP	San Bernardino	Needles	rail	ΊE	El Garces station restoration (ext 5-02)	Feb-03	640 1,883	0	640	U	U
							1,883				
	Other Bail and Ti	ransit Noncapacity									
DID	Kings	KCAPTA	<u>y.</u> bus	8526	Intermodal transfer site improvements (State only)	May-03	400	0	340	0	60
	Los Angeles	Santa Clarita	rail		Newhall Metrolink, expand parking (ext 6-02)	Apr-03	100	0	100	0	
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		Bicycle parking at 5 Pasadena Blue Line stations (SO)	May-03	85	0	85	0	
	Tulare	Tulare	bus	8631		May-03	1,904	0	1,904	0	
	Various	Caltrans	rail	2017	Carsharing development (intercity rail)(02S-18)	Apr-03	1,975	0		0	
	Various	Califalio	Tun	2017	Caronaring development (interesty raii)(020-10)	7101 00	4,464		1,070	J	
							1, 101				
	Signalization and	Intersection Imp	roveme	ents:							
RIP	Butte	Caltrans	99		Durham Pentz Rd, off-ramp signals	Feb-03	590	0	590	0	0
	Butte	Paradise	loc		Skyway/Wagstaff intersec rehab	Feb-03	66	66	0	0	
	Fresno	Fresno	loc		CMAQ match, Marks/Weber intersection	Feb-03	18	0	18	0	
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		Sepulveda/Burbank intersec (98S-75)	May-03	1,184	0		0	
	Los Angeles	LA County	loc		Carson St signal synch, LB Bl-Bloomfield	May-03	1,427	0	1,427	0	
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		Eagle Rock ATSAC (ext 5-02)	Feb-03	2,516	0	2,516	0	
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		Eagle Rock ATSAC (ext 6-01)	Feb-03	1,187	0		0	
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		Eagle Rock ATSAC	Feb-03	766	0	766	0	
	Los Angeles	Downey	loc		Lakewood BI signal interconnect (00S-40)	Dec-02	112	0	112	0	
	Los Angeles	Downey	loc		Lakewood BI signal interconnect (00S-40)	Dec-02	1,035	0	1,035	0	
	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills	loc		Central traffic signal system (ext 6-02)	May-03	325	0	325	0	

					Allocation		STIP	Project Totals by Component			
	County	Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Month	Total	R/W		E&P	
	County	, igonoy	1110	11110	1.10,000		. Otal		0000		
RIP	Los Angeles	Agoura Hills	loc	2875	Central traffic signal system	May-03	399	0	399	0	0
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		Valley Circle BI at Rt 101, intersec improvts (SO)	May-03	301	0		0	
	Los Angeles	Vernon	loc		Atlantic/Bandini intersec improvs (ext 5-01)	Jan-03	2,437	0		0	
	Marin	Marin County	loc		CMAQ match, Downtown Signal System Mgmt	Feb-03	23	0		0	
	Mendocino	Ukiah	loc		North State St curb ramps, 2 intersecs (State only)	May-03	18	0		0	
RIP	San Luis Obispo	Morro Bay	loc		Rt 1/Rt 41 roundabout (State only)	Jun-03	441	0	441	0	
RIP	Santa Barbara	S B County	loc	223G	Evans Av/Ortega Hill Rd intersection	May-03	310	0	310	0	0
RIP	Tulare	Visalia	loc		Emergency vehicle preemption, 34 intersections	May-03	186	0	186	0	0
							13,341				
	<b>Bicycle and Pede</b>										
	Contra Costa	Lafayette	loc		Reliez Valley Rd walkway (State only)	Jan-03	109	0		0	
	Contra Costa	San Pablo	loc		San Pablo Dam Rd ped path (State only)	Jun-03	115	0		0	
	Contra Costa	Martinez	loc		Bay Trail, phase 2 segments (State only)	Jun-03	300	200	100	0	
	Fresno	Fowler	loc		CMAQ match, replace sidewalks, 5th, Main	Apr-03	5	0	5	0	
	Humboldt	Humboldt Co	loc		Walnut Dr, Cypress-Avalon, bike lanes	Dec-02	551	0	551	0	
RIP	Lassen	Lassen County	loc		Skyline Rd Ext/South, bikeway (98S-111)	May-03	74	74	0	0	
	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	loc		San Fernando Rd bike path (ext 6-01)	Jan-03	2,302	0	2,302	0	
	Los Angeles	Compton	loc		Compton Cr bike path, Greenleaf-Artesia	May-03	388	0	388	0	
	Los Angeles	Pasadena	rail		Pasadena Blue Line ped enhancements	May-03	399	0	356	0	
	San Mateo	BART	loc		SFO Airport Bicycle Trail (State only)	Jun-03	1,343	655	688	0	
RIP	Santa Barbara	Caltrans	101		Evans-Sheffield, NB aux In, bikeway (grf, increase)	Jun-03	836	0		0	
RIP	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	loc	1197	Sidewalk installation (locs not ID'd)(State only)	Jun-03	200	0	200	0	0
							6,622				
	Soundwalls:										
IIP	Alameda	Caltrans	92	900	Hesperian BI-Santa Clara St, soundwalls	Jun-03	670	0	670	0	0
	Kern	Caltrans	99		White Lane soundwall	May-03	625	0		0	
RIP	San Bernardino	Caltrans	215		Soundwalls, Grand Terrace, Barton Rd-Newport Av	May-03	1,389	0		0	
	San Diego	Chula Vista	loc		Rt 805 Orange-Palomar sndwalls (00S-21)	Jun-03	1,145	0		0	
	Ventura	Oxnard	loc		Soundwall, SB Rt 101, Snow Av-Jardin Dr (02S-17)	May-03	425	0		0	
	Ventura	Ventura	loc		Soundwall, E Main St-S Hill Rd (02S-17)	Jun-03	469	0		0	
	Ventura	Thousand Oaks	loc		Soundwall, Lynn Rd-Wendy Dr (02S-17)	May-03	1.689	9		0	
	Vontara			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Country of (OEC 11)		6,412		.,000		
	Undesignated ma			-1.5-							ļ
	Fresno	COFCG	mat		CMAQ match reserve	Jun-03	665	0		0	
	Madera	Madera CTC	mat		CMAQ match reserve	May-03	67	0		0	
RIP	San Benito	San Benito COG	loc		CMAQ match reserve (ext 5-02)	May-03	30	0	30	0	
	San Diego	SANDAG	loc		RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match reserve	May-03	22	0		0	
	San Diego	SANDAG	loc		RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match reserve	May-03	241	0		0	
RIP	Santa Clara	MTC	loc		CMAQ match reserve (98S-122)	Jun-03	797	0		0	
RIP	Stanislaus	StanCOG	mat	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match reserve	May-03	383	0	383	0	C

						Allocation	STIP	Project	Totals I	oy Com	ponent
	County	Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Month	Total	Ŕ/W		E&P	
RIP	Stanislaus	StanCOG	mat	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match reserve	May-03	5	0	5	0	0
RIP	Tahoe RPA	Tahoe RPA	mat		CMAQ match reserve	May-03	173	0	173	0	
							2,383				
	Rideshare Progra	ams:									
RIP	Riverside	RCTC	tdm	9801	Rideshare program (02 STIP)	May-03	400	0	400	0	0
RIP	San Diego	SANDAG	tdm	7404		Jun-03	1,644	0	1,644	0	0
							2,044				
	Park and Rides:										
RIP	Marin	Marin CMA	loc	320C	Manzanita park and ride, phase 2	May-03	244	0	244	0	0
RIP	Marin	Marin CMA	loc	320C	Manzanita park and ride, phase 2	Jun-03	67	0	67	0	0
RIP	Sonoma	MTC	mat	2172	CMAQ match (ext 6-02), Roh Pk Park & Ride (\$323K)	Feb-03	323	0	323	0	0
RIP	Sonoma	Caltrans	101	782G	Park/Ride, Rohnert Park interch (98S-106)	May-03	125	0	125	0	0
							759				
	Miscellaneous:										
RIP	Stanislaus	StanCOG	mat	9951	CMAQ match, one dump truck	Apr-03	9	0	9	0	0
							9				
			Total (	Constru	ction in FY 02-03 Described as Noncapacity		60,634				
	Project Programm	│ med in FY 03-04	4 (Incorre	ctly Incl	uded in Prior Listing of FY 02-03 Projects):						
RIP	San Diego	SDMTDB	rail	978		May-03	7,000	0	5,250	0	1,750

### California Transportation Commission Streets and Highways Committee May 6, 2003

# DISCUSSION DRAFT

### **REVIEW OF AB 872 PROJECTS FOR ALLOCATION PLAN**

#### **Issue**

At the April 3 Commission meeting, in response to testimony on the Allocation Plan, the Commission asked staff to review and provide a list of all STIP projects for which local agencies have begun work with the intention of requesting project reimbursement allocations under AB 872. A copy of the list is attached. Should some or all of these projects be added to the Allocation Plan?

#### **Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Commission add to the STIP Allocation Plan for 2002-03 those projects on the attached list for which Department records indicate that work was started by December 2002. This would add \$1.4 million in project components to the Plan.

Staff recommends that projects begun after December 2002 not be given priority on the basis of AB 872 and that they be treated in accordance with the Commission's priorities for all other projects in the Allocation Plan.

### **Background**

Government Code Section 14529.17, as added by AB 872 (1999), permits a local agency to expend its own funds for a STIP project, in advance of the Commission's approval of a project allocation, and to be reimbursed for the expenditures subsequent to the Commission's approval of the allocation. However, the statute does not require the Commission to approve an allocation it would not otherwise approve. Expenditures for projects programmed for Federal funding still require advance approval of the Federal obligation for the project. Reimbursements may be made under AB 872 only for eligible expenditures incurred within the 12 months preceding the date of Commission allocation. As noted in the Commission's STIP Guidelines, "It is important that any local agency intending to take advantage of the reimbursement provisions of Section 14529.17 understand its obligations and the risk that is inherently involved."

### **Discussion:**

None of the projects on the attached list falls into one of the categories assigned high priority in the Allocation Plan. The basis for adding projects to the Plan would be that the local agencies started the projects in advance of receiving an allocation without an understanding of the risk created by the pending cash flow shortage. The basis for excluding projects for which work started after December 2002 would be that the agencies knew or should have known of the risk,

given the Commission's suspension of project allocations and the suspension of the Department's delegated authority for project allocations.

The list includes only pending AB 872 projects as reported by the Department. There may be other projects for which local agencies intended to request reimbursement allocations under AB 872. The Department asks local agencies for prior notification in order to verify expenditures or qualify projects for Federal funding. However, nothing in the statute or in the STIP Guidelines requires an agency to notify the Commission or Department in advance of starting work in order to qualify for an AB 872 reimbursement allocation.

# PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEGUN WORK PRIOR TO ALLOCATION (AB 872)

						Const		Anticipated
County	Agency	PPNO	Project	Amount	Component	Year	Work Start	Allocation
17	Didocarat	0000	W Didnesses DI Makes Okias I also A lane	4.000	E O D		20 4 00	A! 00
Kern	Ridgecrest		W Ridgecrest Bl, Mahan-China Lake, 4-lane	1,000	E&P	none	30-Apr-02	April-03
Humboldt	Humboldt County		McKinleyville Av, Washington Av, rehab (S/O)	48	PS&E	04	1-Sep-02	August-03
Humboldt	Humboldt County	2081	Union St/Sea Av, reconstruct/widen (State only)	144	E&P	07	18-Oct-02	August-03
Humboldt	Humboldt County	2089	- 1	40	PS&E	05	1-Nov-02	August-03
Humboldt	Humboldt County	2093	Central Av (McKinleyville), rehab (State only)	53	PS&E	05	1-Nov-02	August-03
Butte	Paradise	2L120	Skyway/Wagstaff intersec rehab	66	R/W	03	27-Nov-02	April-03
Butte	Butte County	1L47	West 8th Av reconstruction (ext in May-02 to Oct-03)	22	PS&E	02	2-Dec-02	May-03
Stanislaus	StanCOG	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match	1	match	03	12-Dec-02	June-03
Stanislaus	StanCOG	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match	20	match	03	12-Dec-02	June-03
Stanislaus	StanCOG	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match	2	match	03	12-Dec-02	June-03
Stanislaus	StanCOG	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match	4	match	03	18-Dec-02	June-03
			Subtotal through December 2002	1,400				
Plumas	Plumas County	2345	Chester-1st Ave Bridge rail replace, HBRR match	25	E&P	none	14-Jan-03	April-03
Mendocino	Fort Bragg		Main St and Laurel St, signal (State only)	11	PS&E	04	23-Jan-03	April-03
Glenn	Willows		Pacific Av, Green-N City Limits, reconst (State only)	7	PS&E	03	1-Feb-03	April-03
Fresno	Fowler	6L02	CMAQ match, replace sidewalks, 5th, Main	7	match	03	2-Mar-03	April-03
Humboldt	Fortuna	2078	RR crossings, 3 locations, upgrade (State only)	30	Const	04	17-Mar-03	August-03
Stanislaus	StanCOG	9951	RSTP/CMAQ/TEA match	2	match	03	8-Apr-03	October-03
Butte	Butte County	2L93	Neal Rd, 4.7-5.9 mi E of Rt 99, rehab	610	Const	03	30-May-03	June-03
			Subtotal since December 2002	692				
			Total	2,092				